Identity Formation in the New Testament

Edited by
BENGT HOLMBERG
and MIKAEL WINNINGE

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
227

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor
Jörg Frey (München)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors
Friedrich Avemarie (Marburg)
Judith Gundry-Volf (New Haven, CT)
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

227

Identity Formation in the New Testament

Edited by

Bengt Holmberg and Mikael Winninge

Mohr Siebeck

Bengt Holmberg is professor emeritus at Lund University, Sweden.

Mikael Winninge is associate professor at Umeå University, Sweden.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151516-3
ISBN 978-3-16-149687-5
ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at *http://dnb.d-nb.de.*

© 2008 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Großbuchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

To a certain extent the present volume is a reflection of ideas expressed in lectures and seminar discussions during the Nordic New Testament Conference in August, 2007. However, as it now stands, it is a volume about different means of identity formation and identity negotiation in New Testament times as well as in the history of reception of the New Testament up to the present. In recent scholarship, New Testament ideology and its theoretical and practical use in church history is often analysed and deconstructed by applying gender perspectives and postcolonial theory.

The Nordic New Testament Conference 2007 took place at Sundsgårdens Folkhögskola (college of higher education), in the vicinity of Helsingborg in southern Sweden, August 18–22, 2007. The theme of the conference was *Strategies of Identification in the Hellenistic World: Ethnic, Social, and Ideological Perspectives*. A number of speakers were of course invited to give keynote lectures related to the overall topic. In addition, the conference hosted six seminar groups, where several papers were read and discussed. The themes were (1) *Personification in the New Testament Apocrypha*, (2) *Intertextual Means of Identity Formation*, (3) *Gender Identification*, (4) *The Role of Biblical Traditions in Identity Formation*, (5) *Various Strategies of Identification*, and (6) *Postcolonial Hermeneutics*. There was an open call for papers so that Nordic scholars interested in presenting their work were invited to submit proposals.

In the first seminar group, led by Jón Ma. Ásgeirsson (Iceland), the phenomenon of personification was studied and discussed. The making of a character is a category already in ancient rhetorical instruction. It has found a renewed interest in modern theories on the role of the reader(s) in contemporary literary studies. The focus of this seminar was on personification *in the New Testament Apocrypha*. One of the issues was how, and in what sense, *personae* are depicted, used or fabricated for instance in relation to characters in the New Testament or the wider cultural and literary environment of the early Christian era.

The second seminar group, led by Mikael Winninge (Sweden), focused on intertextuality. The concept of intertextuality is controversial, not least for methodological reasons. The word has been used with reference to different phenomena and various methods. Nevertheless, many scholars are convinced that certain texts influence the way in which other texts are composed and interpreted. Quotations are seldom a problem as such. However, the supposed amount of implicit influence is often a matter of dispute

and the force of allusions can be difficult to evaluate. Not only is the Biblical material interesting here; various Greco-Roman texts have been adduced as relevant for the interpretation of New Testament texts. Phenomenological and methodological clarification of the concept of intertextuality is crucial, regardless of what texts are being discussed. And criteria are needed. One particular aspect that was considered is the way in which intertextuality functions within different frames of social identity. Special attention was paid to the use that some groups in the Hellenistic world could make of certain socially recognized texts as implements of identity formation. Moreover, rhetorical strategies in this process of social identity formation were investigated and discussed.

The third seminar group, led by Marianne Bjelland Kartzow (Norway), discussed identity formation in a gender perspective. For more than 25 years, scholars within the field of feminist studies have focused on women in the New Testament texts in order to question their role as silenced and marginalized. Reconstructions of early Christian history and readings by a hermeneutic of suspicion have been central tasks within this field. A growing awareness of the difficulties in using the category of 'woman' has made scholars ask whether the texts give any significant information about women as such, or if they primarily reflect male ideals and fantasies. The huge difference regarding legal rights, life condition and recourses between the upper class women and the slaves or prostitutes in the Hellenistic world make the use of the term 'woman' as a label for all female characters in Antiquity problematic. The tendency in New Testament scholarship to present history as a gender neutral concept has recently been challenged. The ancient world was gendered, and this influenced the rhetoric and ideology in the texts. In order not to show gender blindness, it is not enough to add a small section on 'women' at the end of a study. The field of male studies has focused for some years now on how New Testament texts operate within a culture where the question of whether a man performed the proper requirements of masculinity was crucial.

In the fourth seminar group, led by Jostein Ådna (Norway), the role of biblical traditions was the main issue. Among the forces forming the identity of early Christians, the Holy Scriptures of Israel were the most decisive. The early church shared with all strands in early Judaism the conviction that the true and only God had revealed himself to Israel, and that ever since the Holy Scriptures of this people contained the testimony of this revelation and the word of God. Hence, it is an interesting and rewarding enterprise to trace the influence of the Bible on the identity formation among various groups and communities within early Christianity. Both the transmission of individual biblical books and the development of biblical traditions in the Hellenistic period are complex phenomena. Papers that

investigated certain details within the wide scope of this process as well as papers that addressed broader aspects, such as the influence of these texts and traditions on Christology, were discussed in the seminar.

The fifth seminar group, led by Sven-Olav Back (Finland), had planned to focus on liturgy as identity formation, because among other things liturgy functions as an expression and a celebration of the distinctive norms, values and ideals of the worshipping community. However, because of the diverse perspectives among those submitting paper proposals to the conference, the seminar group discussed various strategies of identification among early Christians and other contemporary groups.

The sixth seminar group, led by Lone Fatum (Denmark), focused on the hermeneutics of postcolonial theory. The term 'postcolonialism' was coined about 25 years ago. In general, it describes a paradigm of critical interpretation, analysing historical constructs of political domination by means of colonization and marginalization. It involves a number of different disciplines in order to deal with complex power relations, and to identify the relationship between the colonized, the collaborators and the colonizers is in itself an act of resistance. In Biblical studies in particular, postcolonial interpretation is defined and practiced as an oppositional reading strategy and, as such, it may be seen as a continuation of political and liberation theology and gender studies. It examines the role of the Gospel narratives and other New Testament texts in colonizing, decolonizing and new nation-building, and it works explicitly from the perspective of opposition to the centre and from the margins in order to identify the exclusive boundaries. The seminar discussed postcolonialism both as a theory, as a particular way of reading the New Testament in a modern-day borderland perspective, and as practice, exemplifying what it means to ask questions of the following kind: What characterizes the relations and administration of power in the symbolic world of Paul? How are centre and margins defined in the mission narratives of Acts? Whose world is constructed and who is excluded and by what means in the Pastoral letters? Who are the colonizers and how is 'the other' represented in the Gospel of John?

This book illustrates the paradoxical character of writing about early Christian identity on the basis of early Christian texts. On the one hand, the phenomenon of identity cannot be limited to the ideas and words that Christ-believers in these communities used to express their self-understanding, i.e. to ideas which can be more or less easily read off from the texts produced by that movement. Identity is a larger, more complex social reality with both cognitive, ritual, and moral dimensions, crystallized into social relations and institutions, and developing in both predictable and surprising directions over time. All this can be only partly expressed in texts.

On the other hand, texts are almost the only means available for grasping early Christian identity, just as for grasping most things which belong to that historical movement in its first century. Hardly any archaeological remains exist from the Christ-movement in the period during which the New Testament writings emerged. This is one reason why the essays in this volume naturally and inevitably are devoted to analysing New Testament texts in some attempts to show how they reveal the processes of identity formation. This is done in a variety of ways: through analysis of intertextuality and techniques of textual identity construction, through labelling and social cognition and through gender analysis coupled with the power-sensitive postcolonial reading of ancient Christian texts.

The first group of essays look closely at how New Testament texts compare with, or treat, older texts which stand in the same normative tradition, in other words with biblical and Jewish texts. This is the focus of Samuel Byrskog's analysis of the role of the first human beings (Adam/Eve) in Pauline Christology, possibly mediated through Jewish interpretation of the Eden narratives, as well as of Tobias Hägerland's exploration of possible points of contact between the excommunication rituals used in the Qumran community and those used in the Christian community in Corinth, and of Per Jarle Bekken's comparison of how Philo and John treat the question about the validity of self-testimony. Identity has dimensions both of continuity with a tradition, and of breaking new paths in relation to such a tradition.

The next group of essays deals with more explicitly literary techniques used in the service of constructing identity. Judith Lieu analyses how personification is achieved in Jewish and Christian texts, and what functions it can be given, while Lauri Thurén's close look at how antagonists are treated in New Testament writings leads to the conclusion that their existence is more of a rhetorical (or even theological) necessity than a historical reality. Thomas Kazen seeks to show how a collective or corporative understanding of the Son of Man figure helps us see the Christ-movement, and Raimo Hakola's analysis of the stereotyping of the Pharisees in Matthew is a variation of the same approach to understanding the relationship between a text and the history behind it, informed especially by social psychology. Finally, Rikard Roitto demonstrates the advantages of using theories of social cognition in order to determine the relationship between different kinds of social identity among the early Christ-believers.

In post-modern approaches, scholars often apply highly abstract and sophisticated theories and methods to biblical texts in order to elucidate realities that are anything but abstract, namely power relations. This is characteristic both of feminist or gender analysis, and of post-colonial exegesis. In the third group of essays, Halvor Moxnes begins by focusing on how the

understanding of the male body is changed in some Christian texts, thus signalling a break with prevailing opinions that would affect Christian identity. Fredrik Ivarsson uses ancient protocols of masculine sexual behaviour, mainly dominance and self-restraint, to elucidate Paul's dominance techniques in 1 Corinthians, while Hanna Stenström brings perspectives of gender analysis to bear on the shaping of Jewish (in *Joseph and Aseneth*) and Christian (Rev) "virginal" identity, pointing both to similarities with and differences from the surrounding culture.

The last group of essays presents three ways of applying the insights of postcolonial theory. Hans Leander looks at Mark and the terminology of *parousia* as not only reflecting, but also forming, Christian identity in relation to imperial reality, while Christina Petterson compares how indigenous people are described as objects of Christian mission in Greenland and in Samaria and Asia Minor in a way that reflects "colonial" attitudes, as part of her discussion of how postcolonialism should and should not be applied in biblical exegesis. As is the case with several essays in this book, Anna Rebecca Solevåg's work on the martyrs Perpetua and Felicitas could be classified in more than one category. It uses both gender analysis and postcolonial insights to show how empire, family, and gender are reinterpreted in this narrative, in order to make suffering and persecution meaningful, thus continuing and elucidating some ways of thinking and acting that emerge already in the New Testament.

Hopefully, the application of so many different interpretative perspectives and approaches to the phenomenon of early Christian identity formation will help the reader to see how it emerges and appears in all its bewildering and intriguing complexity.

Table of Contents

Preface V

Christology and Identity in an Intertextual Perspective: The Glory of Adam in the Narrative Substructure of Paul's Letter to the Romans 1
Samuel Byrskog

The Controversy on Self-Testimony according to John 5:31–40; 8:12–20 and Philo, *Legum Allegoriae* III.205–208 19
Per Jarle Bekken

Rituals of (Ex-)Communication and Identity: 1 Cor 5 and 4Q266 11; 4Q270 7 43
Tobias Hägerland

Literary Strategies of Personification 61
Judith Lieu

The Antagonists – Rhetorically Marginalized Identities in the New Testament...79
Lauri Thurén

Son of Man and Early Christian Identity Formation 97
Thomas Kazen

Social Identity and a Stereotype in the Making: Pharisees as Hypocrites in Matt 23 123
Raimo Hakola

Act as a Christ-Believer, as a Household Member or Both? A Cognitive Perspective on the Relation between the Social

Identity in Christ and Household Identities in Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Texts 141
Rikard Roitto

Body, Gender, and Social Space: Dilemmas in Constructing Early Christian Identities 163
Halvor Moxnes

A Man Has to Do What a Man Has to Do: Protocols of Masculine Sexual Behaviour and 1 Corinthians 5–7 183
Fredrik Ivarsson

Masculine or Feminine? Male Virgins in *Joseph and Aseneth* and The Book of Revelation 199
Hanna Stenström

The Parousia as Medicine: A Postcolonial Perspective on Mark and Christian Identity Construction 223
Hans Leander

Mission of Christ and Local Communities in Acts 247
Christina Petterson

Perpetua and Felicitas: Reinterpreting Empire, Family and Gender 269
Anna Rebecca Solevåg

Contributors 285
Bibliography 287
Index of Ancient Sources 317
Index of Modern Authors 333
Index of Subjects and Terms 339

Christology and Identity in an Intertextual Perspective: The Glory of Adam in the Narrative Substructure of Paul's Letter to the Romans

Samuel Byrskog

The Problem and the Task

Christology has to do with Christian identity. The books on New Testament Christology usually go through a number of labels and deeds attributed to Jesus. To the extent that we have given up the old distinction between "the person of Christ" and "the work of Christ," we find a broader spectrum of Christological thinking that relates, in theological terms, to soteriology and anthropology.[1] To understand Christ and what he has done is to understand ourselves. Some scholars use non-theological language to express a similar thinking about Christology, emphasizing the labeling processes and the importance of Jesus for the labeling group.[2] The early conviction that something crucial had happened in the person and work of Jesus Christ gave rise to a variety of interpretations of who Christ is and this meant that the early Christians nourished a sense of belonging to that decisive event – an identity.

In this new situation the concept of being the image of God lingers in the periphery of scholarly contributions. Yet this is a concept that unites an understanding of Christ with an understanding of human beings and what Christ is for them, and it epitomizes Christology as a part of identity formation. In New Testament scholarship it finds expression in the so-called Adam Christology. From early on in his career, James Dunn has stressed the occurrence of allusions and references to Adam in the Pauline letters. In Paul's letter to the Romans, which Dunn regards as the central guideline for Pauline theology, he finds such allusions in Rom 1:18–32; 3:23; 7:7–

---

[1] So Veli-Matti KÄRKKÄINEN, *Christology: A Global Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 11–12.

[2] For an early example of this trend, see Bruce J. MALINA and Jerome H. NEYREY, *Calling Jesus Names: The Social Value of Labels in Matthew* (F&F: Social Facets; Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988).

11; and 8:19–22.[3] The mention of Adam in Rom 5:12–21 is thus surrounded by recurrent allusions to him elsewhere in the letter. Dunn's view represents British scholarship, which goes back to Morna Hooker's influential article on Romans 1.[4] Others, however, deny the presence of such motifs. Stanley Stowers argues strongly that Dunn's understanding of these passages does not fit the pre-70 context of Paul.[5] The so-called Adam Christology in Romans is a controversial point of debate and suggestive of a plurality of scholarly approaches and opinions.

Scholars who agree to see several allusions to Adam in Romans are often content to say that while in 5:12–21 Adam is employed christologically, the other passages deal with the present situation of human beings.[6] We rarely find attempts to co-ordinate the different allusions. *I wish to bring the debate one step further by asking about the existence of a narrative substructure that holds together the allusions and the explicit reference to Adam in Romans and opens up avenues to a more dynamic thinking about Christology and identity*. Paul discusses Adam in a prolific way also in 1 Cor 15:21–49. His discussion in Romans depends partly on these reflections, which, in turn, might have been influenced by even broader currencies. What is necessary in today's Christological debate, however, is that we relate these grand theories of Pauline thinking to a clear conception of the particular epistolary character of the sources. In Romans, if anywhere, Paul would be able to employ his earlier reflections in a mature and consistent way.

Method: Modified Intertextuality

In order to investigate the narrative substructure of Romans, I will employ a modified intertextual perspective. "Intertextuality" is one of those trendy expressions that are being used in many different ways.[7] Sometimes it de-

---

[3] So in e.g. in James D. G. DUNN, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 90–101.

[4] Morna D. HOOKER, "Adam in Romans 1," *NTS* 6 (1959–60), 297–306; "A Further Note on Romans 1," *NTS* 13 (1966–67), 181–83. Cf. also A. J. M. WEDDERBURN, "Adam in Paul's Letter to the Romans," in *Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Writers* (ed. E. A. Livingstone; JSNTSup 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1980), 413–30.

[5] Stanley STOWERS, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 86–89.

[6] So e.g. Christopher M. TUCKETT, *Christology and the New Testament: Jesus and His Earliest Followers* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001), 52.

[7] Ellen van WOLDE, "Trendy Intertextuality?," in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel* (ed. Sipke Draisma; Kampen: Kok, 1989), 43–49.

scribes an author's way of borrowing and transforming a previous text; sometimes it indicates the dynamics of a reader's or hearer's referencing of one text in reading or hearing another. Richard Hays has been influential among New Testament scholars in introducing the term as a label for the study of Paul's use of Scripture. He has a seven-fold list of criteria for establishing the presence of echoes and allusions: availability, volume, recurrence or clustering, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, history of interpretation, and satisfaction.[8] It indicates an ambition to study Paul's use of Scripture historically and genetically, but not necessarily in terms of what Paul had intended the audience to understand. He also uses John Hollander's concept of rhetorical "transumption" or "metalepsis" (i.e. a temporal or diachronic figure of speech) in delineating the reading strategy of taking a literary text as an echo-chamber of earlier texts.[9]

Other scholars have warned against the naïve use of intertextuality as it is often used to refer to literary relations of conscious influence and intentional allusion to, citation of or quotation from previous texts in literary texts. The Canadian New Testament scholar Thomas Hatina argues for instance that it is inimical to historical criticism due to its poststructuralist ideological origin, its conception of text as infinite and inseparable from the reader, and its opposition to the notion of influence.[10] Graham Allen, an acknowledged expert on the theory of intertextuality, writes accordingly:

> Intertextuality is one of the most commonly used and misused terms in contemporary critical vocabulary. […] Intertextuality, one of the central ideas in contemporary literary theory, is not a transparent term and so, despite its confident utilization by many theorists and critics cannot be evoked in an uncomplicated manner.[11]

We will always run the risk of misusing theoretical concepts once they leave the hands of their originators and enter the open market of scholarly methodologies. My approach to intertextuality, while inherently historical, avoids some of the pitfalls mentioned above in that it is informed by theories of social memory and orality.[12] In his monograph on Romans, Philip Esler criticizes Hays' intertextual approach for being too literary and too

---

[8] Richard B. HAYS, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29–33. See also Richard B. HAYS, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 34–45.

[9] Cf. John HOLLANDER, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981).

[10] Thomas HATINA, "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism: Is There a Relationship?," *BibInt* 7 (1999), 28–43.

[11] Graham ALLEN, *Intertextuality* (London: Routledge, 2000), 2.

[12] See e.g. Samuel BYRSKOG, "A New Quest for the *Sitz im Leben*: Social Memory, the Jesus Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew," *NTS* 52 (2006), 319–36.

focused on the reading of written texts.[13] What we need, according to Esler, "are ways of understanding the social (more than literary) processes involved in Paul's reinterpretation of scripture […] that make sense in a context of oral and aural communication."[14] For Esler, the alternative approach includes collective memory, where prototypes from the past may be used to negotiate social identity.[15] Although Esler might be correct to criticize Hays at this point, it should be noted that one of the basic insights of Julia Kristeva and others was that the text is an intervention into a cultural system of other texts that condition its meaning, the author of it being more of its orchestrator than its originator. The text is dialogical and has its origin, not in the intention of the author, but in the multiple discursive contexts of the immediate culture of that text and that author.[16] *In theories of the oral character of a text, the text is a web of meaning and meaning-effects that depend on the cultural signs encoded in the text and that condition the experience of it during and after the performance. To the extent that it contains traces of a cultural system of other written and oral texts, it is a reservoir of collective memory and affects the hearers' negotiation of how they remember the past socially and construe their social identity.*

From this perspective, the letter to the Romans can be seen as an epistolary echo-chamber of remembered inter-texts, resonating them, as it were, and producing various meaning-effects to those who experience(d) its oral performance. For the present purposes, I will explore possible conceptual features in the sequential epistolary performance that may have aroused echoes from stories about Adam.

Romans 1–3: The Loss of Glory

The Texts: Romans 1:23; 2:23; 3:23

In order fully to appreciate these sounds and echoes, it is necessary to outline the possible intertextual traces of Adam in Paul's depiction of the present human situation. According to Rom 1:23, men and women "exchanged the glory of the immortal God (ἤλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου

---

[13] For another important discussion of Hays' methodology, see Hans HÜBNER, "Intertextualität – die hermeneutische Strategie des Paulus," *TLZ* 116 (1991), 881–98.

[14] Philip F. ESLER, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 177.

[15] Esler focuses on Abraham rather than Adam.

[16] See e.g. Julia KRISTEVA, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (ed. Leon S. Roudiez; New York: Columbia University Press, 1980). I have used ALLEN, *Intertextuality*, 30–47, as a brief introduction to Kristeva's thinking.

θεοῦ) for images resembling a mortal human being and birds and four-footed animals and reptiles." Stowers spends several pages of his book denying the presence of any allusions to Adam and the so-called fall story of Gen 1–3 in Rom 1:18–32 and argues for a generic similarity with Hellenistic decline of civilization narratives used for hortatory purposes.[17] He depends on John Levison's thesis that there existed no Adam speculation and no Adam myth before 70 CE,[18] concluding that Jewish literature before 70 CE shows little interest in the effects of Adams's transgression and that his fall cannot serve as an explanation for the human predicament.

Stowers misrepresents Levison. That Levison did not intend the conclusions that Stowers infers from his work becomes evident in a subsequent article where Levison sets out precisely to show that Rom 1:18–25 exhibits correspondences with the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve* to the extent that it is not "altogether implausible that Paul used some form of this narrative […] in the construction of his argument."[19] Levison's article can be developed further. What is particularly important in Rom 1:23 is the motif of exchanging God's glory. It theologizes the broad cultural pattern of honor and shame which Paul unfolds in chapters 2 and 3. Turning to the interlocutor in 2:17, Paul refers to the interlocutor's pride in the Law and his God and turns this pride against the interlocutor, accusing him in 2:23 of dishonoring God by transgressing the Law. Obedience to the Law is a matter of bringing glory to God. Furthermore, bringing the argument of the first three chapters to a close in 3:21–31, Paul forms an *inclusio* with 1:23 and explains the foundational statement that God's righteousness through Jesus' faithfulness is for all who believe, with the basic premise in 3:23 that all have sinned and fall short of God's glory.

The Inter-texts

a) LXX Psalm 105:20; Jeremiah 2:11; Deuteronomy 4:16–18

The motif of God's glory evokes a mosaic of echoes which mix voices that allude to Jews and to Adam. Stowers discusses the reference to LXX Ps 105:20 (MT 106:20) and, indirectly, LXX Jer 2:11. The texts say that the Israelites "exchanged their glory" (ἠλλάξαντο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν) (Ps 105:20) and that God's people "exchanged its glory" (ἠλλάξατο τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ) (Jer 2:11). Stowers denies that these texts echo in Romans, except for "some imagined brilliant reader," because the Israelites lost *their* glory,

[17] STOWERS, *A Rereading of Romans*, 86–100.

[18] John LEVISON, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPSup 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988).

[19] John LEVISON, "Adam and Eve in Romans 1.18–25 and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve," *NTS* 50 (2004), 519–34 (523).

not God's, and they did not make idols of human beings and reptiles, as Rom 1:23 says.[20]

Both arguments fail to convince. The glory of the Israelites is their God. That is why the Psalmist goes on to say that they forgot God their Savior (LXX Ps 105:21); and that is why the prophet Jeremiah contrasts a nation which changes its false gods to God's people changing its glory (LXX Jer 2:11). When they exchange their glory, they exchange their God. Stowers's second argument fails to take the list in Deut 4:16–18 into account. The Deuteronomist tells how Moses commands obedience from the people by admonishing them not to make for themselves "a carved image, any idol, an image of male or female" (γλυπτὸν ὁμοίωμα, πᾶσαν εἰκόνα, ὁμοίωμα ἀρσενικοῦ ἢ θηλυκοῦ). The text goes on to prohibit images of any animal that is on the earth, of any winged bird that flies in the air, of any "reptile" (ἑρπετοῦ) that creeps on the ground, and of any fish that is in the water under the earth. The list includes mortal men as well as birds and four-footed animals and reptiles mentioned in Rom 1:23 and uses for them the terms "idol" (εἰκῶν) and "image" (ὁμοίωμα). Stowers is silent about this text. It did not take a very "brilliant reader" but only a hearer who knew the written Torah to hear an echo of it in the list enumerated by the performer of Paul's text. And this hearer, to the extent that s/he also knew the Psalms and the Prophets, heard the passage in terms of how the Israelites lost their glory. The three inter-texts have sufficient terminological and conceptual similarities with Rom 1:23 to signal echoes that partly determined how it was heard and experienced.

The reason why Stowers and others are reluctant to acknowledge these inter-texts is the ambition to regard the text in Romans as dealing with non-Jews only. Certainly Paul here uses traditional polemic against Gentiles, and he might indeed turn texts directed against the Israelites around and use them against Gentiles. Considering the letter as an echo-chamber of various inter-texts, it seems however appropriate to refrain from fixing the ethnic identity of men and women (ἄνθρωποι) referred to in 1:18 more than Paul does and to cope with a textual openness that allows the hearers to discern different paradigms for sinful mankind in the following verses.[21]

---

[20] STOWERS, *A Rereading of Romans*, 93. Stowers strangely admits that MT Ps 106:20 speaks of God's glory (p. 342 n. 39). NRSV also translates "they exchanged the glory of God." But the Hebrew reads "their glory" (*'et-kavodam*).

[21] Similarly Robert JEWETT, *Romans: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 152: "[…] an encompassing description of what is wrong with the human race as a whole."

b) The Life of Adam and Eve 20:2; 21:6; 33:5; 35:2

The motif of exchanging, falling short of or being estranged from one's glory was also associated with Adam and traced back to the time before the people of Israel existed. The Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*, sometimes entitled the *Apocalypse of Moses*, articulates this view most clearly. On his death-bed Adam asks Eve to tell all the children how they transgressed. She does so at some length. According to some mss, Eve was the first one to be deprived of her glory. After eating the fruit which the devil had sprinkled with the evil poison of covetousness, she realized that she was naked, having lost the righteousness, and she cried out to the devil weeping: "Why have you done this, that I have been estranged from my glory" (ὅτι ἀπηλλοτριώθην ἐκ τῆς δόξης μου)? (20:2).[22] She tried to find leaves to cover her shame (αἰσχύνην) and began looking for Adam. After finding him, she spoke to him with the voice of the devil and persuaded him to eat of the fruit. He realized his nakedness and said to Eve: "O evil woman! Why have you wrought destruction among us? You have estranged me from the glory of God" (ἀπηλλοτρίωσάς με ἐκ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ) (21:6).

We find here a similar ambiguity as in the LXX concerning whose glory is at stake. Eve speaks of her glory with which she was clothed; Adam speaks of God's glory. The reference to Eve's glory might be a secondary addition to the story. What is significant is that Adam sees his own nakedness in relation to his estrangement from God's glory. This does not mean that Adam is no more the image of God. As the story continues, Adam dies and Eve witnesses the return of God with his angels. The angels, worshipping God, pray for forgiveness for Adam on account of him being God's image: "Holy Jael, forgive, for he is your image (εἰκὼν σου) and the work of your holy hands" (33:5); "Forgive him, O Father of all, for he is your image" (εἰκὼν σου) (35:2). As God's image, Adam becomes estranged from God's glory and as God's image he suffers the consequences of his transgression.

It is difficult to date the *Life of Adam and Eve* with precision and the Latin version, which is probably a translation from the Greek, does not contain the sections referred to above. Due to the presence of Hebraisms in the Greek text, most scholars hold the archetypal Greek manuscript to be a translation from the Hebrew. We find no clear evidence of a post-70 situation. An interpolation into the Latin *Vita* 29:8 even refers to Herod's temple without mentioning its destruction. Johannes Tromp's recent text-critical investigation assumes that the first Greek version was composed

[22] The text is missing in several mss.

somewhere in the period between 100–300 CE.[23] If that is correct, it is not implausible that the Hebrew document(s) came into being already in the first century CE. M. D. Johnson argued in the introduction to his translation in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* that the span for the original composition is between 100 BCE and 200 CE and, building on the investigation of J. L. Sharpe, that it was composed in Pharisaic circles in Palestine.[24] It's non-allegorical and midrashic character might point in this direction.

c) Philo, De virtutibus 203–205; the Book of Wisdom 2:23–24; the Book of Jubilees 3:17–31

It is thus not unlikely that some ancient hearer/reader in the first century CE experienced Paul's statement in Rom 1:23 as an echo of what happened to Adam and that this hearer/reader captured some of the culturally imbedded signals in the text. The *Life of Adam and Eve* articulates in fact what is hinted at in earlier texts.

Philo, speaking in *De virtutibus* of the nobleness of "the first man who was created out of the earth" (203), suggests that Adam's deliberate decision to choose what was false and disgraceful and evil and to despise what was good and honorable and true meant that he defiled himself as God's image and was deprived of blessedness and happiness (205). The Book of Wisdom, which most scholars agree echoes in Rom 1:18–32, says that God made humankind (τὸν ἄνθρωπον) "an image of his own eternity" (εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας αἰδιότητος) but through the devil's envy death entered into the world and those who are of his party experience it (2:23–24). Elsewhere in Wisdom Adam figures as the first-formed father of the world's transgression (10:1). The Book of Wisdom was probably written by an oppressed Egyptian Jew during the first or second century BCE. The unrighteous ones are the Gentiles and their evil is traced back to the time of Adam and connected with him being God's image. The *Book of Jubilees*, from the second century BCE, elaborates in 3:17–31 the story of Adam's disobedience and expulsion in a way that includes the Israelites. While all the beasts are expelled with Adam, to Adam alone it is granted to cover his shame, so that those who know the Law will cover their shame and not be like the Gentiles (3:30–31). Here Adam's failure and shame are related to

---

[23] Johannes TROMP, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek* (PVTG 6; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 28.

[24] M. D. JOHNSON, *OTP* II, 252. Sharpe's dissertation, *Prolegomena to the Establishment of the Critical Text of the Greek Apocalypse of Moses* (Duke University, 1969), was never published. For a recent review of it, see Tromp's summary in *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek*, 5–8. Tromp also gives an updated discussion of research on the Greek text.

the Law of Israel. The idea is that Adam's covering of his shame finds its recurrent manifestation through the observance of the Law.

The Echoes in Romans 1:23; 2:23; 3:23

At closer scrutiny, the argument that Adam's fall cannot serve as explanation for the predicament of Jews and Gentiles according to the first chapter of Romans because it does not fit the pre-70 situation, fails to convince. The year 70 is no decisive turning-point for the speculations about Adam. My argument is not that Adam is alluded to in the entire section of Rom 1:18–32. Rather, I have focused on the motif of exchanging God's glory. Rom 1:23 seems to echo inter-texts that indicate an emerging trajectory which gradually explicates how Adam exchanged God's glory and comes to full expression in the first or second century CE writing entitled the *Life of Adam and Eve*. The rabbinic literature develops it further.[25] Since Adam was God's image, and remained so, his shame mentioned in some of these texts suggests in effect that he was estranged from God's glory.

The author of *Jubilees*, while not speaking explicitly of God's glory, articulates the idea that the Israelites were included in the shame of Adam and may cover it by observing the Law. In this way they avoid being like the Gentiles. By implication, transgression of the Law reveals the shame of Adam. It is therefore logical that Paul uses the language of shame and glory when he turns to his interlocutor and in the climactic statement of Rom 2:23 accuses the one who transgresses the Law for dishonoring God. Adam's shame becomes visible through the transgression; God's glory is exchanged and defiled. Paul turns the argument of the *Jubilees* around and likewise employs Isaiah's report about Israel's oppression by the Gentiles as a scriptural proof for the Jewish failure to honor God (Isa 52:5). The *Jubilees* defends the Israelites, like Isaiah, and distinguishes them from the sinful Gentiles. Similarly, without true observance of the Law, Paul's interlocutor shares in the Gentile predicament going back to Adam's shame and is included among those who exchange the glory of the immortal God for images of human beings and animals.

It is possible to maintain the hypothesis that beneath the surface of Paul's depiction of the human predicament lies a narrative substructure of Adam's failure to live up to being God's image and the resulting shame of defiling God's glory. In 3:23 Paul brings these intertextual echoes to a cli-

[25] See e.g. Jacob JERVELL, *Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen* (FRLANT 58; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), 112–114. Jervell fails however, like most of his contemporaries, to distinguish the later rabbinic development from earlier tendencies and neglects the importance of the *Life of Adam and Eve*.

max with an emphatic “all,” and indicates a way forward. The change from the aorist “sinned” (ἥμαρτον) to the present tense “fall short” (ὑστεροῦν–ται) shows that he looks at the current disgraceful situation from the perspective of a comprehensive sinful past of all men and women and, by implication, thinks of God’s righteousness through Jesus Christ as the restoration of God’s glory. This is in line with the expectation expressed in the *Life of Adam and Eve* 39:2. Adam, as we saw, never lost his status as God’s image. At his burial, God promises that he will establish him in dominion on the throne of his seducer. In the rabbinic literature it is Adam’s glory that will be restored (*Gen R.* 12:6; *Num R.* 11:3). Already the Qumranites expressed their anticipation of glory as “all the glory of *adam*/Adam” (1QS IV, 23; CD III, 20; 1QH XVII, 15). At 3:23 Paul hence forms an *inclusio* with 1:23 and explains the important statement that God’s righteousness through Jesus’ faithfulness is for all who believe with the premise that all have sinned and fall short of God’s glory, indicating that his central Christology echoes a narrative substructure that not only tells of Adam’s failure but also looks forward to the restoration of God’s glory.

Romans 5–8: The Way to Glory

Romans 5:2, 12–21

From this perspective it comes as no surprise that a few verses before expounding the relationship between Adam and Christ in 5:12–21, Paul exhorts the hearers/readers to boast in their hope of sharing God’s glory (5:2).[26] And this boasting, he explains a few verses later, means essentially that they boast in God through their Lord Jesus Christ through whom they now have received reconciliation (5:11). Paul has arrived at a point in his argumentation where he begins to christologize the intertextual concept of Adam’s glory and indicates a hope for a glorious future.

It is significant that he continues these references in the first half of chapter 5 with a long section where Adam explicitly comes to the surface and is related to Christ. The emphatic “therefore” (διὰ τοῦτο) in 5:12 indicates a connection back to the previous section and shows that he wants to explain the reason for the previous exhortations. Boasting in God through the Lord Jesus Christ and in the hope of sharing God’s glory is based on what is expounded about Adam and Christ. The intertextual echoes in the references to God’s glory in 1:23; 2:23; 3:23 are thus explicitly confirmed

[26] For text-critical issues, see Samuel BYRSKOG, *Romarbrevet 1–8* (Kommentar till Nya testamentet 6a; Stockholm: EFS-förlaget, 2006), 123.

to the hearers/readers, and christologically focused. The initial "therefore" signals a link which can be best explained if we assume that the hearers/readers had already heard the echoes of Adam's lost glory.

The point of 5:12–21 is that Christ did what Adam failed to do and that their actions had consequences for all men and women.[27] The long digression in 5:13–17 serves to assure the hearers/readers of the fact that there were differences between the two figures, but Paul's aim is still to compare them. Whereas Adam was disobedient, Christ was obedient; whereas Adam's disobedient trespass led to condemnation and sin, Christ's obedient act of righteousness leads to justification and life. The future life, which Paul mentions three times as the result of Christ's obedience (5:17, 18, 21), is equivalent to the future glory (cf. 6:4; 8:18, 21). As it seems, Paul articulates, through a mosaic of intertextual echoes, an Adam Christology which presupposes the failure of the first Adam and transfers the hope of restoration to Christ as the new, faithful Adam. Therefore, that is, because Christ did what Adam did not do when he exchanged God's glory, the believers are to boast in God through the Lord Jesus Christ and in the hope of sharing God's glory.

Romans 7:7–13

Paul's discussion of the Law in 7:7–13 reads like a commentary on the statement in 5:13–14 that sin was in the world before the Law, and that death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses. The much discussed question of possible allusions to Adam in Romans 7 rarely takes into account the fact that the hearers/readers encountered this chapter of Romans after experiencing the performance of chapter 5.[28] When Paul in 7:13 concludes that it was sin working death in "me" and that sin becomes sinful beyond measure through the commandment, he explicates what it meant that sin was in the world already before the Law and how it came about that death exercised dominion already at the time of Adam. To be sure, the shadows of the mythical Medea lurk in the background as Paul later on in the chapter explains the *akrasia* of the "I."[29] But to the extent that the one man

---

[27] See further BYRSKOG, *Romarbrevet 1–8*, 135–46.

[28] The most recent monograph on the topic is the one by Hermann LICHTENBERGER, *Das Ich Adams und das Ich der Menschheit: Studien zum Menschenbild in Römer 7* (WUNT 164; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004). Lichtenberger gives a good survey of the previous discussion.

[29] See Samuel BYRSKOG, "Anthropologie als Heilsgeschichte. Römerbrief 7,14–20," in *Verantwortete Exegese: Hermeneutische Zugänge – Exegetische Studien – Systematische Reflexionen – Ökumenische Perspektiven – Praktische Konkretionen*. FS Franz Georg Untergassmair (ed. Gerhard Hotze and Egon Spiegel; Vechtaer Beiträge zur Theologie 13; Berlin: LIT-Verlag, 2006), 245–52.

through whom sin came into the world is Adam according to chapter 5, the "I" who experienced death according to chapter 7 also resembles Adam.

In order to bring home his argument about the Law before Sinai, Paul focuses on the commandment "you shall not covet." This is the commandment which came and revived sin and killed "me." The transgression of Adam, of which Paul speaks in 5:12–21, and which leads to death even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam (5:15), is defined in chapter 7 as covetousness, ἐπιθυμία (7:7). Again Paul produces an intertextual echo of Adam that makes covetousness into a core element of sin and surfaces in the *Life of Adam and Eve*. In 19:3, a few lines before Adam is estranged from God's glory, Eve tells how the serpent sprinkled his evil poison on the fruit that she was to eat and explains that this poison is covetousness. "For covetousness," she continues, "is the κεφαλή of every sin." Other texts outside the Pauline corpus say similar things,[30] but this text is particularly significant in that it couples covetousness to the sinful act of Adam and Eve and expounds its consequences in terms of losing God's glory. The fact that Paul makes covetousness the central sinful act in spite of the fact that the verb ἐπιθυμεῖν does not appear in the Genesis story is not an argument against the presence of allusions to Adam – these allusions are probable on other grounds. On the contrary, it points decisively to echoes from textual worlds similar to the ones expressed in the *Life of Adam and Eve*. Read intertextually, Rom 7:7–13 resonates how it was that Adam lost God's glory and died.

Romans 8:18–30

When Paul brings the entire first half of Romans to a climax in chapter 8, he indicates links back to the discussion of the human predicament in 1:18–32 and counters it in 8:29–30 by connecting the idea of Christ as the image of God with the final glorification of the believers. The entire section of 8:18–30 deals with the future glory of the believers. It is therefore logical that the row of descriptions of what it means to be conformed to the Son's image, ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ,[31] according to God's purpose ends with the climactic reference to their glorification.

There is a similar apocalyptic perspective in 1:18–32 as in 8:18–30. The language of revelation heads both sections and indicates a comparable perspective of divine disclosure. Moreover, creation also plays an important

[30] E.g. Jas 1:15; *4 Macc*. 2:4; *Spec*. 4.84. *Apocalypse of Abraham* 23:8–14, perhaps originally a Hebrew document from ca 100 CE, also brings this idea back to Adam and Eve and tells how Azazel is permitted to have dominion over those who, like Adam and Eve, desire evil.

[31] I understand this expression to be epexegetic, "the image, which is his Son."

role in these passages. Just as creation may point towards the revealing of God's children in 8:19–22, so it points towards God's eternal power and divine nature in 1:20. And just as men and women were in bondage to corruption and decay and exchanged God's glory according to 1:23, the creation will be set free from decay and obtain the freedom of the glory of God's children according to 8:21. Paul turns the dark picture of 1:18–32 around and forms an *inclusio* to the entire first half of Romans by pointing to the glorious future of those who love God and are called according to his purpose.

At this point in the sequential argument of the letter, Paul uses his previous discussion and formulates a Christology that makes Christ into the image of God. Three interrelated observations add up to the conclusion that he employs an Adam Christology. First, from 1:23; 2:23; and 3:23 we may assume that the glorification of the believers was heard/read as the retaining of God's glory which mankind had exchanged and lost. The believers' glory is intrinsically bound up with God's glory. Secondly, the language of Christ as God's image carries connotations to Adam. In addition to the obvious uses of the concept of image for Adam in the Old Testament and Jewish texts, some of which have been noticed above, 1 Cor 15:45–49 contrasts the first and the second Adam and says that the believers have borne the image of the man of dust and will also bear the image of the man of heaven. Paul's interest is here in describing the resurrection body. In fact, in Rom 8:23 we find a similar use of "bodies" just before the reference to the image of God's son. However, the Greek term εἰκών was no natural equivalent to σῶμα and indicates therefore that it was Paul's mention of Adam that evoked ideas of being created as God's image. The somewhat redundant statement in Rom 8:29b that the Son, as God's image, will be the firstborn among many brothers also leads to ideas connected with Adam. In 5:18–21 Paul made the point that both Adam and Christ should be seen in relation to many that follow; and in 1 Cor 15:20, a few verses before, referring to Christ as the last Adam, he speaks of Christ's resurrection as the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep. Thirdly, we should notice that the notions of God's image and of glory are closely related for Paul, in spite of the fact that they are not associated in the creation accounts. According to 1 Cor 11:7 the man is the image and glory of God. Paul alludes to the creation accounts and adds the concept of glory to point out that man exists to God's honor. In 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4 the transformation of the believers from one degree of glory to another is first said to be into the same image as the Lord, whose glory they see as in a mirror, and then connected to the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God. The second verse makes it probable that the use of "image" in the former verse carries Christological connotations. The language of Chris-

tophany in 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4 indicates that Paul's idea of Christ as the image and glory of God has its roots in a fundamental visionary experience. Since the two concepts are not associated in the creation accounts, but, as we have seen, in the *Life of Adam and Eve*, it is likely that his experience was colored by intertextual echoes of Adam being the one who is and remains God's image and his expectation that the glory of Adam will be restored. In Rom 8:29–30 Paul would therefore use this fundamental Christology which was at the heart of his own experience of the Risen Lord and make the narrative substructure of Adam culminate in the conviction that the glorification of the believers means in effect that they will be conformed to the image of God's son.

Conclusions

The Narrative Substructure about Adam

The reading of Romans presented above has argued that we cannot do away with Adam as a substantial part of Paul's Christological argumentation. *In Romans we find an implicit narrative substructure that centers on Adam, the image of God, who with all mankind has lost God's glory and as the new Adam, Christ, will retain it and bring glory to all men and women. Paul does not present this Adam Christology paradigmatically but unfolds it progressively through allusions and with rhetorical finesse, until he explicitly combines the concepts of image and glory towards the end of chapter 8 and climactically concludes the entire first half of Romans with a reference to the future glorification of the believers*. As Levison has pointed out,[32] the *Life of Adam and Eve* should be upgraded as an important inter-text presenting a story which includes several of the elements of God's lost glory that echo in Romans. The hearer/reader acquainted with that story, or with a version of it, could hardly miss this significant narrative substructure of Paul's epistolary communication.

Some scholars, in addition to Dunn, would argue that Adam was a crucial if not *the* crucial center of Pauline Christology. N. T. Wright understands the Adam Christology to be an Israel Christology and makes this view fundamental for his understanding of Jesus as Messiah and Lord and of the people of God.[33] Against Wright we can observe that the Adam speculations were not so uniform as to provide a basis for his equation of

[32] LEVISON, "Adam and Eve," 519–34.

[33] N. T. WRIGHT, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 18–40 *et passim*.

Adam and Israel and that several of the passages in Paul's letters which Wright mentions hardly refer to Israel alone. Seyoon Kim, while critical of both Dunn and Wright, thinks that the Adam Christology was an important development of Paul's fundamental vision of Jesus Christ as the image of God on the Damascus road.[34] The strength of his hypothesis is the presence of terms and concepts related to the term "image" in visionary experiences recounted in other texts. Unfortunately, however, he relies uncritically on later rabbinic ideas concerning Adam in order to make his case. Although they arrive at different and debatable conclusions, Dunn, Wright and Kim agree that Adam was a core element in Paul's understanding of Christ, to the extent that we can speak of a center of Pauline Christology.

The present study, while not taking a stand on the different views of the development of Pauline Christology generally, adds to the observations of these scholars a focus on Adam's role in the sequential epistolary performance of Romans. Allusions and references to Adam were heard/read intertextually as part of a narrative substructure echoing his destiny.

Christology as Inclusive Story

This study leads to reflections concerning Christology and identity both from the perspective of the narrativization of history in the substructure of Romans and from a more pronounced theological perspective. Dunn, Wright, and Kim – to mention only these three – construct their conceptions by tracing tradition-historical connections and by combining a variety of Pauline passages into Christological schemes. Christology is propositional, it seems, and seen in terms of certain fundamental ideas and beliefs concerning Jesus Christ.

The focus on the sequential epistolary performance brought to attention in this study brings with it a different, narrative perspective on the role of Christology in identity formation. As one of the few New Testament scholars who has reflected hermeneutically on the Biblical concept of *Imago Dei*, Samuel Vollenweider, while skeptical as to its anthropological dimensions, points to its realization in the singular history of Jesus:

> Allein schon diese Beobachtung rät davon ab, die Gottebenbildlichkeit als diese oder jene ontologische Gegebenheit zu identifizieren. Sie scheint sich vielmehr in einer *zeitlichen* Gestalt zu inkarnieren. In ihrer Gottebenbildlichkeit haben die Glaubenden teil an einer

[34] Seyoon KIM, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 165–213.

bestimmten Geschichte, konkret an den Ereignissen von Kreuz und Auferstehung Christi.[35]

Vollenweider's observation, which assumes that history should be conceptualized in terms of events located temporally in the past, can be carried over to the way history is employed narratively in the Pauline Adam Christology. *Looking at the Adam Christology from the perspective of intertextuality and social memory rather than tradition history, it emerges as an unfolding story which interacts with other similar stories and mnemonically negotiates meaning and identity to the hearers/readers*. History is narrativized. Prototypes, whether we think of Abraham or Adam or other forms of ancestor worship, are part of narrative structures that make sense of history, not as an event merely located temporally in the past, but as the remembered, and thus narrativized past, which interacts with the search for identity in the present.

This is in line with how memory functions socially. The social memory usually learns to remember and narrate the past according to conventional plot structures and mnemonic patterns. It narrativizes history and gives social meaning by positioning past events in relation to each other. The socialization into a mnemonic community provides patterns that help each individual to mentally string such events together into coherent, culturally meaningful narratives. Identities are projects and practices, not properties, and emerge from the ways we are positioned by and position ourselves in the narratives of the past.[36]

To the extent that Adam functions as a prototype of both the fallen mankind and the resurrected Christ, Christology becomes much more dynamic and much less propositional in that it deals with the grand narrative of God's dealings with his creation and invites believers into the history and story of Christ. The approach to Christology proposed here is essentially one that seeks coherent narrative substructures and that may liberate us to recover Christology as the inclusive telling of a magnificent drama.

Adam Christology and the Plurality of Christologies

The presence of this kind of Adam Christology also challenges us to take seriously the presence of a plurality of Christologies in today's theological

[35] Samuel VOLLENWEIDER, "Der Menschgewordene als Ebenbild Gottes. Zum frühchristlichen Verständnis der *Imago Dei*," in Vollenweider, *Horizonte neutestamentlicher Christologie: Studien zu Paulus und zur frühchristlichen Theologie* (WUNT 144, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 53–70 (65–66).

[36] See further BYRSKOG, "A New Quest for the *Sitz im Leben*," 325–26. Cf. also "A Century with the *Sitz im Leben*: From Form-Critical Setting to Gospel Community and Beyond," *ZNW* 98 (2007), 1–27 (26–27).

landscape. To the extent that we wish to relate New Testament Christology to the post-modern and post-secular situation of the 21st century, it is noteworthy that Adam rarely comes into focus in the present debate. The hermeneutical potentials of the fact that Paul used Adam in the narrative substructure of Romans 1–8 as a means to argue for the final glorification of all Jews and Gentiles who believe, are regularly neglected in the different attempts to formulate Christological reactions to the global pain of mankind as well as in the dialogues between various ethnic and religious groups.

The reason is perhaps the strong focus on Christ that emerges from conceptualizing him as the new Adam. It might be worthwhile to remind ourselves of the exceptional importance that Wolfhart Pannenberg attached to the Adam imagery in Paul's Christology. Being very aware of the challenge of secularism and the inter-religious dialogue of last century, he has in the second volume of his systematic theology, published for the first time in 1991, two long chapters on "Würde und Elend des Menschen" and "Antropologie und Christologie," respectively, and he places Paul's Adam Christology at the center of the discussion.[37] In Pannenberg's anthropology it is important to demonstrate that belief in God is not foreign to the human being. S/he is destined for fellowship with God, because s/he is created to be his image. Here he also finds the link from anthropology to Christology. Christology moves from below, Pannenberg insists. With the help of the concept of Jesus as the new Adam, he develops his understanding of Jesus' humanity as the fulfillment of human destiny. Jesus is the eschatological new human and the prototype of the new humanity, bringing to fulfillment the destiny of humanity as God's image. And this is a corporate reality, not only individual, according to Pannenberg. Human destiny, which is to enter into fellowship with God, can only be fulfilled in the community of God's images.

Pannenberg perceptively realizes that the Adam Christology presents a conceptual bridge between anthropology and Christology and a foundation for negotiating the salvific identity of God's community. He is provocatively emphatic on the public character of truth and the encompassing validity of Christ as the new Adam of all humanity. In a global situation, where truth is far from uniform and contextual, and where Christologies are linked with culture specific movements, we might wish to modify his theological proposals. The present debate about the force of Paul's Adam Christology must seek to hear the basic contours of the story once again, that is, listen to the universal story of honor and shame that unites all

[37] Wolfhart PANNENBERG, *Systematische Theologie* (3 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988–1993), 2:203–364.